



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,284	06/01/2005	Anthony F Scian	13210-202	1861
1059	7590	10/30/2008	EXAMINER	
BERESKIN AND PARR			DONABED, NINOS J	
40 KING STREET WEST				
BOX 401			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
TORONTO, ON M5H 3Y2			2444	
CANADA				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/537,284	SCIAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NIÑOS DONABED	2444	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 August 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9, 14-22, 25-34, 39-47 and 50-55 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-9, 14-22, 25-34, 39-47 and 50 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/10/2008</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

Response to Amendment

This action is in response to Applicant's amendment dated 08/12/2008. Claims 1, 14-15, 22, 25, 29, 39, 40, 45-47, 51, and 54 have been amended. Claims 10-13, 23-24, 35-38, and 48-49 have been canceled. Claims 1-9, 14-22, 25-34, 39-47 and 50-55 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are geared towards software *per se*. Independent Claims 1, 22, 29, 47, and 54-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material *per se*.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive

material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994)

Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas, stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because “[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer.”).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 1-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Regarding independent claims 1, 22, 29, 47, and 54-55, the phrase “derived from a message to distinguish the message” and “to distinguish the current message” are considered new matter. Dependent claims are rejected for being dependent on independent claims 1, 22, 29, 47, and 54-55.

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 1-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1, 22, 29, 47, and 54-55, the phrase "derived from a message to distinguish the message" is vague and unclear. the pre-selection criterion remains vague and unclear.

Further regarding 1, 22, 29, 47, and 54-55, the phrase "each message in the up to n previous messages is allocated to an associated user-selected folder in the plurality of folder" is vague and unclear because "an associated user-selected folder" is unclear.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-9, 14-22, 25-34, 39-47 and 50-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung, (**US Patent Application Publication 2004/0117451 A1**), herein referred to as Chung in view of Segal (“Mailcat : An Intelligent Assistant for Organizing E-mail”) further in view of Entwhistle (United States Patent Application Publication 20020040370).

Regarding **Claims 1, 22, 29, and 47, 54 and 55**,

Chung teaches a system (**See Paragraph [0006]**) for preselecting a folder for a current message, the folder being one of a plurality of folders, the system comprising: (**See figures 1, and 4-8**)

(a) a storage module for storing the plurality of folders; (**See figures 1, 4-8 and Paragraphs [0006] through [0007], a data storage system**)

(b) a communication module for receiving or transmitting the current message; (**See Paragraphs [0158] through [0164], a recipient server**)

(c) a folder pre-selection cache having n configurable entries, n being a predetermined positive integer greater than one, each configurable entry being configurable to record an associated pre-selection criterion, derived from a message to distinguish the message, for matching with the current message and an associated folder identification for identifying an associated folder in the plurality of folders; (**See figure 1, step 110 and Paragraphs [0158] through [0164], a folder pre-selection cache having n configurable entries**)

(d) a message comparison module for comparing a comparison criterion, derived from the current message to distinguish the current message, with the associated pre-selection criterion of at least one entry in the folder pre-selection cache to determine a matching entry in the folder pre-selection cache; and, (**See figure 1, step 110 and Paragraphs [0158] through [0164], a message comparison module**)

(e) a folder selection module, for selecting the folder identified by the associated folder identification of the matching entry when the message comparison (**See figure 1, step 110 and Paragraphs [0158] through [0164], a folder pre-selection module**)

a user-interface means for displaying the current message and the pre-selected folder wherein the user-interface means comprises a folder selection module operable by a user, and the folder selection module is operable by the user to allocate the current message to a user selected folder in the plurality of folders; (**See figure 10 E, a user-interface for displaying the current message and the pre-select folder operable by the user is shown, Chung**)

Chung does not explicitly teach a “pre-selection” folder selection module.

Segal teaches a “pre-selection” folder selection module. (**See pages 1-3, Segal teaches a folder pre-selected for a received email. Segal also teaches that three folders are pre-selected from which the user can choose from to place the electronic mail.**)

However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have known to combine Segal with Chung because both deal with methods which help

a user classify emails amongst a number of user created folders. The advantage of Segal is that Mailcat's predictions are accurate over 80-90% of the time.

Entwhistle teaches updating a cache-updating means for updating the folder pre-selection cache based on up to n previous messages undergoing folder selection prior to the current message, n being a positive integer greater than 1, wherein each message in the up to n previous messages is allocated to an associated user-selected folder in the plurality of folders; (**See paragraphs [0007], - [0012], Entwhistle.**)

the folder pre-selection cache includes a corresponding configurable entry for each message in the up to n messages; and, (**See paragraphs [0022], - [0028], Entwhistle.**)

the cache-updating means is operable, for each message in the up to n messages, to update the folder pre-selection cache by configuring the corresponding configurable entry in the folder pre-selection cache such that the associated pre-selection criterion is derived from the message, and the associated folder identification of the corresponding entry identifies an associated user-selected folder previously selected for the message. (**See paragraphs [0007], - [0017], Entwhistle.**)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention as made to have known to combine Entwhistle with Chung and Segal because both deal with selecting a folder for an incoming email in an email system. The advantage of Entwhistle is that it "reduces amount of time to be spent for retrieving e-mail information by selecting location of document automatically making the system of

Chung and Segal more robust and efficient." (**See paragraphs [0001] – [0007], Entwhistle**)

Regarding Claim 2,

Chung and Segal further teach the system as defined in claim 1 wherein when the message comparison module fails to determine the matching entry in the folder pre-selection cache, the folder pre-selection module is operable to select a default folder. (**See Paragraph [0083], if a folder does not exist, the message will be put in the next higher (default) folder, Chung**)

Regarding Claim 3,

Chung and Segal further teach the system as defined in claim 1 further comprising a user-interface means for selectively changing the positive integer n. (**See Paragraph [0084], at least one more folder is created, Chung**)

Regarding Claim 4,

Chung and Segal further teach the system as defined in claim 1 further comprising a cache-updating means for automatically changing the positive integer n based on available storage space in the storage module for the folder pre-selection cache. (**See paragraphs [0021] – [0024], Chung.**)

Regarding Claim 5,

Chung and Segal further teach the system as defined in claim 1 further comprising a designation means for designating a plurality of the current messages, wherein the message comparison module is operable to compare at least one comparison criterion, derived from at least one of the plurality of the current messages, with the associated pre-selection criterion of at least one entry in the folder pre-selection cache to determine the matching entry in the folder pre-selection cache; and, the folder pre-selection module is operable to pre-select the folder for the plurality of the current messages. (**See pages 1-3, Segal.**)

Regarding Claim 6,

Chung and Segal further teach the system as defined in claim 1 wherein the comparison criterion is the current message. (**See Figure 1 and Paragraph [0164], the current email message is sorted and categorized into a folder, Chung**)

Regarding Claim 7,

Chung and Segal further teach the system as defined in Claim 1,
Chung does not explicitly teach that the system is a mobile communication device.

However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, would have known that the system could be a mobile device, such as a laptop or a cell phone, because such devices are often used in conjunction with electronic mail.

Regarding **Claim 8**,

Chung and Segal further teach the system as defined in claim 7 wherein the current message is from a server and comprises a server-determined folder identifier for identifying a server-determined folder for storing the current message. (**See Paragraphs [0158]-[0161], an application on the received email server checks the mail for a pre-defined folder identifier, Chung**)

Regarding **Claim 9**,

Chung and Segal further teach the system as defined In claim 8 wherein the server-determined folder identifier has an assigned weight, the assigned weight being one of a first weight and a second weight: when the server-determined folder identifier is of the first weight, the server-determined folder is pre-selected if the message comparison module fails to determine the matching entry in the folder pre-selection cache, and the folder identified by the associated folder identification of the matching entry is pre-selected if the message comparison module determines the matching entry in the folder pre-selection cache; and, when the server-determined folder identifier is of the second weight, the server-determined folder is pre-selected. (**See pages 1-3, Segal.**)

Regarding **Claim 14**,

Chung and Segal further teach the system as defined in claim 1 wherein, when a message in the up to n messages is moved from a first folder in the plurality of folder to

a second folder in the plurality of folders, the cache-updating means is operable to update the associated folder identification for the corresponding entry from identifying the first folder to identify the second folder. (**See pages 1-3, Segal.**)

Regarding Claim 15,

Chung and Segal further teach the system as defined in claim 1 wherein the folder pre-selection cache comprises an entry replacement sub-module for updating the folder pre-selection cache when a new message is allocated to an associated user-selected folder by discarding an existing entry and adding a new corresponding entry for the new message. (**See page 1 paragraphs 1-3 and page 3, paragraphs 2-4 Segal.**)

Regarding Claim 16,

Chung and Segal further teach the system as defined In claim 15 wherein the folder pre-selection cache comprises a time-and-date sub-module for, for each message in the up to n messages, providing a time-and-date indicator to the corresponding entry for indicating when the message was allocated to an associated user-selected folder, and the entry replacement sub-module is operable to update the folder pre-selection cache when the new message is allocated to the associated user-selected folder by discarding the existing entry having an oldest time-and-date stamp.

(See pages 2-4, Segal.)

Regarding Claim 17,

Chung and Segal further teach the system as defined in claim 15 further comprising a derivation sub-module for, for each message in the up to n messages, deriving the associated pre-selection criterion from an associated selected attribute of the message; and, deriving the comparison criterion from an associated selected attribute of the current message. . **(See page 2 paragraphs 1-3 and page 3, paragraphs 2-4 Segal.)**

Regarding Claim 18,

Chung and Segal further teach the system as defined in claim 17 wherein for each message in the up to n messages, and for the current message, the associated selected attribute. of the message comprises one of an associated sender/recipient attribute of the message, an associated subject attribute of the message; a time sent of the message, a message body contents of the message, and a message encoding of the message. **(See pages 1 paragraphs 1-3 and page 3, paragraphs 2-4 Segal.)**

Regarding Claim 19,

Chung and Segal further teach the system as defined in claim 17 wherein the derivation sub-module comprises a hash determination means for, for each message in the up to n messages, deriving the associated pre-selection criterion from the message by applying a hash function to the associated selected attribute; and, for the current message, deriving the comparison criterion by applying the hash function to the

associated selected attribute. (**See pages 1 paragraphs 1-3 and page 3, paragraphs 2-4 Segal.**)

Regarding **Claim 20**,

Chung and Segal further teach the system as defined in claim 15 wherein each entry in the folder pre-selection cache is ordered according to a search order, the message comparison module is operable to compare the comparison criterion with the associated pre-selection criterion of each entry in the folder pre-selection cache according to the search order to determine a matching entry in the search order having an associated pre-selection criterion matching the comparison criterion; and, the cache-updating means is operable, when the matching entry is not a first entry in the search order and is the user-selected folder, to advance the matching entry within the search order. (**See pages 1 paragraphs 1-3 and page 3, paragraphs 2-4 Segal.**)

Regarding **Claim 21**,

Chung and Segal further teach the system as defined in claim 15 further comprising a restoration means for, when information is erased from the folder pre-selection cache, substantially restoring the folder pre-selection cache by processing each message in the plurality of folders in chronological order from an oldest message in the plurality of folders to a youngest message in the plurality of folders. (**See pages 1 paragraphs 1-3 and page 3, paragraphs 2-4 Segal.**)

Regarding Claim 25,

Chung and Segal further teach the system as defined in claim 22 further comprising a derivation sub-module for, for each message in the up to n messages, deriving the associated pre-selection criterion from an associated selected attribute of the message; and, deriving the comparison criterion from an associated selected attribute of the current message. (**See pages 1 paragraphs 1-3 and page 3, paragraphs 2-4 Segal.**)

Regarding Claim 26,

Chung and Segal further teach the system as defined in claim 25 wherein for each message in the up to n messages, and for the current message, the associated selected attribute of the message comprises **one of** an associated sender/recipient attribute of the message, an associated subject attribute of the message, a time sent of the current message, and a message encoding of the message. (**See pages 1 -3, Segal.**)

Regarding Claim 27,

Chung and Segal further teach the system as defined in claim 26 wherein the derivation sub-module comprises a hash determination means for, for each message in the up to n messages, deriving the associated pre-selection criterion from the message by applying a hash function to the associated selected attribute; and, for the current message, deriving the comparison criterion by applying the hash function to the

associated selected attribute. (**See pages 1 paragraphs 1-3 and page 3, paragraphs 2-4 Segal.**)

Regarding **Claim 28**,

Chung and Segal further teach the system as defined in claim 22 further comprising a cache-updating means for updating the folder pre-selection cache based on up to n previously edited attachments stored in the plurality of file folders. (**See pages 1 -3, Segal.**)

Regarding **Claim 30**,

Chung and Segal further teach the method as defined in claim 29 further comprising pre-selecting a default folder for receiving the current message when step (b) fails to determine the matching entry in the folder pre-selection cache. (**See Paragraph [0083], if a folder does not exist, the message will be put in the next higher (default) folder, Chung**)

Regarding **Claim 31**,

Chung and Segal further teach the method as defined in claim 29 further comprising changing the positive integer n based on available storage space. (**See paragraphs [0021] – [0024], Chung.**)

Regarding **Claim 32**,

Chung and Segal further teach the method as defined in claim 29 further comprising designating a plurality of current messages and pre-selecting the folder for storing the plurality of current messages. (**See pages 1-3, Segal.**)

Regarding Claim 33,

Chung and Segal further teach the method as defined in claim 29 further comprising reviewing the current message for a server-determined folder identifier having an assigned weight wherein the assigned weight is one of a first weight and a second weight; when the server-determined folder identifier is of the first weight, pre-selecting the server-determined folder if the message comparison module fails to determine the matching entry in the folder pre-selection cache, and pre-selecting the folder identified by the associated folder identification of the matching entry when the message comparison module determines the matching entry in the folder pre-selection, cache; and, when the server-determined folder identifier is of the second weight, pre-selecting the server-determined folder. (**See pages 1-3, Segal.**)

Regarding Claim 34,

Chung and Segal further teach the method as defined in claim 29 wherein the comparison criterion is the current message. (**See Figure 1 and Paragraph [0164], the current email message is sorted and categorized into a folder, Chung**)

Regarding Claim 39,

Chung and Segal further teach the method as defined in claim 29 wherein, when a message in the up to n messages is moved from a first folder in the plurality of folders to a second folder in the plurality of folders, step (a) further comprises updating the associated folder identification for the corresponding entry from identifying the first folder to identify the second folder. . (**See pages 3-5, Segal.**)

Regarding Claim 40,

Chung and Segal further teach the method as defined in claim 29 wherein step (a) further comprises updating the folder pre-selection cache when a new message is allocated to an associated user-selected folder by discarding an existing entry and adding a new corresponding entry for the new message. (**See pages 1-3, Segal.**)

Regarding Claim 41,

Chung and Segal further teach the method as defined in claim 40 wherein for each message in the up to n messages, step (a) further comprises providing in the corresponding configurable entry a time-and-date indicator for indicating when the message was message was allocated to an associated user-selected folder, and the folder pre-selection cache is updated when the new message is allocated to the user-selected folder by discarding the existing entry having an oldest time-and-date indicator and adding the new corresponding entry for the new message. . (**See pages 3-5, Segal.**)

Regarding Claim 42,

Chung and Segal further teach the method as defined in claim 40 wherein for each message in the up to n messages, the associated pre-selection criterion is derived from an associated selected attribute of the message; and, the comparison criterion is derived from an associated selected attribute of the current message. . (**See pages 3-5, Segal.**)

Regarding Claim 43,

Chung and Segal further teach the method as defined in claim 42 wherein for each message in the up to n messages, and for the current message, the associated selected attribute of the message comprises one of an associated sender/recipient attribute of the message, an associated subject attribute of the message, a time sent of the current message, a message body contents of the current message, and a message encoding of the current message. (**See pages 1 paragraphs 1-3 and page 3, paragraphs 2-4 Segal.**)

Regarding Claim 44,

Chung and Segal further teach the method as defined in claim 42 wherein for each message in the up to n messages, the associated pre-selection criterion is derived from an associated selected attribute of the message by applying a hash function to the associated selected attribute, and the comparison criterion is derived from an associated selected attribute of the current message by applying the hash function to

the associated selected attribute. (**See pages 1 paragraphs 1-3 and page 3, paragraphs 2-4 Segal.**)

Regarding **Claim 45**,

Chung and Segal further teach the method as defined in claim 29 wherein each entry in the folder pre-selection cache is ordered according to a search order step (b) comprises comparing the comparison criterion with the associated pre-selection criterion of each entry in the folder pre-selection cache according to the search order; and step (c) comprises determining a matching entry in the search order having an associated pre-selection criterion matching the comparison criterion, and pre-selecting the folder identified by the associated folder identification of the first entry; wherein the method further comprises, when the matching entry is not a first entry in the search order and is the user-selected folder, advancing the matching entry within the search order. (**See pages 1 paragraphs 1-3 and page 3, paragraphs 2-4 Segal.**)

Regarding **Claim 46**,

Chung and Segal further teach the method as defined in claim 29 further comprising, when information is erased from the folder pre-selection cache, substantially restoring the folder pre-selection cache by, for each message in the plurality of folders in chronological order from an oldest message in the plurality of folders to a youngest message In the plurality of folders, performing steps (a), (b) and (c). (**See pages 1 paragraphs 1-3 and page 3, paragraphs 2-4 Segal.**)

Regarding Claim 50,

Chung and Segal further teach the method as defined in claim 49 further comprising a derivation sub-module for, for each message in the up to n messages, deriving the associated pre-selection criterion from an-associated selected attribute of the message; and, deriving the comparison criterion from an associated selected attribute of the current message. (**See pages 1-3, Segal.**)

Regarding Claim 51,

Chung and Segal further teach the method as defined in claim 47 wherein for each message in the up to n messages, and for the current message, the associated selected attribute of the message comprises one of an associated sender/recipient attribute of the message, an associated subject attribute of the message, a time sent of the current message, and a message encoding of the message. (**See pages 1 paragraphs 1-3 and page 3, paragraphs 2-4 Segal.**)

Regarding Claim 52,

Chung and Segal further teach the method as defined in claim 51 wherein for each message in the up to n messages, the associated pre-selection criterion is derived from an associated selected attribute of the message by applying a hash function to the associated selected attribute, and the comparison criterion is derived from an associated selected attribute of the current message by applying the hash function to

the associated selected attribute. (**See pages 1 paragraphs 1-3 and page 3, paragraphs 2-4 Segal.**)

Regarding **Claim 53**,

Chung and Segal further teach the method as defined in claim 47 further comprising updating the folder pre-selection cache based on up to n previously edited attachments stored in the plurality of file folders. (**See pages 1 -3, Segal.**)

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-55 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed** to (571) 272-8300 or **mailed** to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NINOS DONABED whose telephone number is (571)270-3526. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30 AM-5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on (571) 272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ninos Donabed/
Examiner, Art Unit 2444
/William C. Vaughn, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444